

REMARKS

In view of the following comments, and pursuant to 37 C. F. R. § 1.111, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Office Action mailed July 16, 2007.

Summary

Claims 1-8 have been rejected as being anticipated by Hara Chie *et al.* (JP App. Pub. No. 08-281856 A). In this response, Applicants have amended claims 1-4, and Applicants have canceled claim 6. Applicants have also added a new claim 9. Claims 2-4 have been amended to further clarify Applicant's invention and to correct grammatical informalities. The amendments of claims 2-4 are not related to patentability as defined by Festo Corporation v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd, 234 F.3d 558, 56 USPQ2d 1865 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (en banc), overruled in part, 535 U.S. 722, 122 S. Ct. 1831 (2002). No new matter has been entered as a result of these amendments.

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 are currently pending.

Claims 1-8: Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated in view of Hara Chie *et al.* As claim 6 has been canceled, the rejection of claim 6 has been rendered moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the remaining rejections, and submits that amended claim 1 is patentable over Hara Chie *et al.* As claim 1 is patentable, the claims that depend therefrom are also patentable.

Claim 1 is generally directed to a transparent coordinate input device. Amended claim 1 now recites, *inter alia*, the feature that the plural ridge portions have a polygonal shape in section and are projected strips longitudinally extending in one direction. Amended claim 1 has been further amended to clarify Applicant's invention and to correct grammatical informalities. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the application as filed, and, in particular, at pages 14-16 and as shown in Figure 4. Hara Chie *et al.* does not teach or suggest plural ridge portions that have a polygonal shape in section and are projected strips longitudinally extending in one direction.

To anticipate a claim, a reference must teach every element of the claim. (See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("MPEP") § 2131). Hara Chie *et al.* generally discloses a transparent conductive film or sheet. According to Hara Chie *et al.*, "[a] rough surface 2 having unevenness is

provided to either one of both surfaces of a transparent substrate 1 and a transparent conductive film 3 is provided on the rough surface." (Hara Chie *et al.*, Abstract). Nowhere in any of the three drawings shown in Hara Chie *et al.* do the three drawings show the construction of the rough surface or of the transparent conductive film. Furthermore, Hara Chie *et al.* is simply silent as to whether the rough surface or the transparent conductive film include ridge portions that have a polygonal shape in section and are projected strips longitudinally extending in one direction. Accordingly, Hara Chie *et al.* does not teach the transparent coordinate input device of claim 1.

Moreover, Hara Chie *et al.* does not suggest the transparent coordinate input device of claim 1, and in particular, that the ridge portions have a polygonal shape in section and are projected strips longitudinally extending in one direction. In fact, Hara Chie *et al.* teaches away from Applicants' invention (See MPEP § 2143.01). As addressed in Applicants' specification at page 3, the transparent conductive film of Hara Chie *et al.* suffers from several technical problems. Notably, the individual projections of Hara Chie *et al.* function as microscopic lens so that many bright spots are formed by the display light of the liquid crystal display panel. Hence, the display is glittered when the liquid crystal display panel is seen from the outside of the transparent coordinate input device. Such glittering and defocusing causes a reduction in the visibility of the liquid crystal display panel. Figure 1 of Hara Chie *et al.* is merely a schematic cross sectional view for illustrating a rough surface and does not address the technical problems addressed by Applicants' invention. As such, Hara Chie *et al.* simply does not suggest the features of claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Hara Chie *et al.* As claim 1 is patentable, the claims that depend therefrom are also patentable.

New Claim 9

New claim 9 recites similar subject matter as claim 1. Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, that a transparent coordinate input device includes plural ridge portions having a predetermined pitch where the ridge portions are curved surfaces longitudinally extending in one direction and having a narrow width in section. Support for this claim can be found throughout the specification as filed and, in particular, at page 22 and in Figure 9.

Hara Chie *et al.* does not teach or suggest the features of claim 9. In particular, Hara Chie *et al.* does not teach or suggest that ridge portions are curved surfaces longitudinally extending in one direction and having a narrow width in section. Accordingly, claim 9 is patentable over Hara Chie *et al.*

Conclusion

Therefore, in view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested.

If for any reason the Examiner is not able to allow the application, he is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./

Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicant
Customer Number 00757

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200